

From: [Coltrain, Katrina](#)
To: [Kady, Thomas](#); [McBurney, Jonathan D](#)
Cc: [Teri Mcmillan \(tcmcmillan@eaest.com\)](#); [Christina Radu \(cradu@eaest.com\)](#); [Luis Vega \(lvega@eaest.com\)](#); [Todd Downham](#); [Turner, Philip](#); [Barry Forsythe](#)
Subject: wilcox--Field investigation draft figures
Date: Thursday, March 17, 2016 1:39:00 PM

Tom/Jon, I like the figures. It is nice to have the information all in one location. Please see a few notes below.

1. I know a lot of time and work has gone into these figures. Is it possible to show the 2D image on a consistent background. For example, Tank Farm Tank 3 is superimposed on the aerial while Tank Farm Tank 5 is superimposed on the sanborn. I like the sanborn because it shows the fluorescence in relation to the Tank that was there.
2. Please include a legend for
 - a. the symbols: the green plus marks, the red circles, the triangles, etc
 - b. an identifier for the x and y-axes on the LIF logs. Assume y is depth and x is %fluorescence.
 - c. define GRO/DRO/ORO and mg/kg
3. Will the text explain the use of the color coding? Will the text explain in detail how the contours were developed (not just for this tank, but for all areas)?
 - a. For example, LOR-1 has a log that is up in the yellow/orange range of %fluorescence but the 2D image shows the location as green which represents a lower %fluorescence and Log LOR-35 is green but has peaks that appear to be between 30-50 %fluorescence and shows blue for the triangle representing the location. It appears that the triangle color is a representation of the fluorescence at the surface and does not give any indication about what is at depth. Can the triangle be all one color that just represents location with no ties to the fluorescence.
 - b. Tank Farm Tank 3: Logs TF-03-05, TF-03-06, and TF-03-09 look to have peaks that exceed 3% but they are not included within the designated fluorescence area.
 - c. Please note that this is seen in several figures, this is just used as an example: LOR-15, LOR-03, LOR-31, TF-05-10, TF-06-05, TF-06-07, TF-06-10, TF-07-03, TF-07-04, TF-08-01, TF-09 (several), TF-10-08, P-04-01.
4. Sample Data--LOR-18 and LOR-25A: many of the contaminants are listed two or three times in the table. Was there a duplicate taken here? If so, please separate results for each. Does one represent PAH SIM?
5. Can you add the 3-D images to the Lorraine figures as was done for the tank farm. Or perhaps, since cross-sections of the plume were presented; the corresponding 3-D cross-section would be good. This will give us a better visualization of the depth and thickness of the fluorescence.
6. Tank Farm Tank 3: Logs TF-03-05, TF-03-06, and TF-03-09 look to have peaks that exceed 3% but they are not included within the designated fluorescence area. [Please note that this is seen in several figures, this is just used as an example.] Will the text explain in detail how the contours were developed (not just for this tank, but for all areas)? This is an awesome 3Dimage, how can I get my view of the 4DIM to look like this?
7. Tank Farm Tank 6: The inset showing the location of Tank 6 is not the correct location. The inset is showing the pit (P-04) rather than Tank 6 which is located just above the pit.
8. Tank 10: is it possible to show the 3-D image in cross section so the depth can be



9750836

seen?

9. Tank 13: Although nothing was noted, for completeness please include a figure for it.

Thanks

Katrina Higgins-Coltrain
Remedial Project Manager
US EPA Region 6
LA/OK/NM Section (6SF-RL)
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75202
214-665-8143